

REMARKS

Claims 28-53 are pending. Claims 28, 30-38, 40, 42-50, and 52 are amended herein. Claim 53 is added herein.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration during the interview of January 12, 2006. Applicant has amended the claims in view of the Examiner's comments.

The Examiner rejected the claims as shown in the following table. Applicant respectfully traverses each of these rejections below.

Statute	Claims	Reference(s)
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)	28, 31, 34, 36-39, and 52	Perkes (2003/0110503)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	29-30, 32, 35	Perkes and Teare (6,151,624)
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	33	Perkes, Teare, and Chadwick (2003/0115219)
same basis as 28-39	40-51	

Perkes describes a media on demand system that contains pre-categorized media of different types. For example, there might be a predefined category for sports, and a predefined subcategory for basketball that contains video that a user can watch about basketball. In contrast, applicant's technology is directed to improving search results delivered by a search engine by automatically categorizing and associating metadata with media based on the context in which it is found on Internet web sites or in other kinds of data stores. For example, applicant's technology allows the creation of a rule that specifies that any content from the address <http://www.cnn.com> should be classified as news, since CNN is a site containing primarily news. Applicant's technology also allows the creation of rules utilizing the layout of a site to automatically categorize content found at the site. For example, applicant's technology allows the creation of a rule that specifies that a file name such as "alito_judicial_confirmation_hearings.mpg" should be interpreted as a video and classified as political news.

Applicant's reference to rules should not be confused with the rules in Perkes related to combining media objects. Unlike Perkes, the rules described by applicant's technology automatically categorize content by applying metadata associated with previously discovered content to newly discovered content found in a similar context. Applicant has amended each of the claims to further clarify these differences. For example, claim 28 recites "based upon the location of the second media entity within the designated portion of the map, automatically attributing the metadata to the second media entity indicating that it belongs to the distinguished category." Claim 40 recites "based upon belonging to the category, automatically attributing the specified metadata to the second media entity." Claim 52 recites "one or more rules for automatically identifying a media entity belonging to the category, such that the contents of the data structure may be used to automatically associate the metadata with identified media entities belonging to the category." In contrast, because all of the media objects described in Perkes are pre-categorized, Perkes does not describe – and has no need of – discerning and attributing categories to media entities as claimed. Accordingly, applicant believes each of the claims is patentable over Perkes and the other cited references, and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration. Applicant believes all required fees are being paid in connection with this response.

However, if an additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 283108004US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Steven D. Lawrenz

Registration No.: 37,376

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant